

**AREA PLAN COMMISSION OF TIPPECANOE COUNTY
ORDINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING**

DATE.....April 7, 2004
TIME.....4:30 P.M.
PLACE.....COUNTY OFFICE BLDG.
20 N. 3RD STREET
LAFAYETTE IN 47901

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	NON-VOTING	STAFF PRESENT
KD Benson	David Williams	Michael Smith	Sallie Fahey
Mark Hermodson	Steve Schreckengast		Margy Deverall
Gary Schroeder	Robert Bowman		Jay Seeger
Dr. Carl Griffin			

KD Benson called the meeting to order.

I. APPROVAL THE MINUTES

Mark Hermodson moved to approve the minutes of the March 16, 2004 meeting. Carl Griffin seconded

KD Benson pointed out a correction on page seven of the minutes. She asked that "Administrative Officers meeting" be inserted as the agenda in question for the topic of sirens.

The motion carried by voice vote with the above correction.

II. DISCUSSION ABOUT POSSIBLE CHANGES TO THE R1 ZONES (INCLUDING R1A, R1B and R1C).

Margy Deverall stated that the recommended changes have been discussed at the Administrative Officers meetings. She explained that since there was not a clear direction, the objective was to present all the information for discussion. She mentioned that a recommendation sheet from the developers was also included and provided by William Davis. She pointed out a chart that compared all of the existing standards to the developer's recommended R1C standard.

William Davis, TBird Design, 4720 South 100 West, Lafayette, IN, recapped the history of this request. He said that at one time the ordinance allowed 10% of the lots to have a reduction of 10% or 20% in width or area. He explained that the reductions were taken away but nothing else was gained in return which prohibited all flexibility in subdivision design. He presented changes to the developers' proposal. He stated that on further review, they have determined that they do not need an R1C classification and the R1Z classification could also be deleted. He reviewed and explained the proposed changes to the existing categories. He suggested changing R1 from 25 to 30% maximum lot coverage because the trend is to build larger houses and garages. He mentioned that the suggested changes for R1A, R1B and R2 all have an increase in lot coverage by 5%. He stated that originally they wanted to reduce the minimum frontage for R1 to 60' but that is no longer appropriate because the frontage could be reduced in their proposal when working with cul-de-sacs and eyebrows. He said that the R1A is one of the biggest problems even for staff because it is used for smaller houses and is not accommodating to additions. He suggested that the minimum frontage for R1A be 60'. He stated that the suggested change for R1B was to reduce the minimum frontage from 60' to 50'. He explained that this would accomplish the goal of an R1C. He said that there were no proposed changes for R1U. He stated that the suggested changes for R2 and R2U were the 5% increase in lot coverage. He proposed that the R3 zone be divided into R3A, R3B and R3C, in order to accommodate different levels of density. He pointed out that R3 zones in urban areas are not listed on the proposal, because they are appropriate as is.

Mark Hermodson asked the staff to comment on William Davis' presentation.

Sallie Fahey stated that this is the first time that the staff has seen this presentation. She said that she could comment on her first impression, but that might not be her lasting opinion. She stated that she had concerns about a 60' lot width on a cul-de-sac lot. She explained that cul-de-sac lots tend to be tight with the existing lot width and that proposal needs further investigation. She said that 5' side-yards in the R1B might be ok if there were no overhangs, however, houses with no overhangs tend not to be attractive.

William Davis stated that 5' would be a minimum and most developers would use 52'. He explained that this was the allowance they would need in order to eliminate additional categories. He pointed out that in the existing subdivisions, less than 50% are at the minimum.

Sallie Fahey stated that there should be further discussion on whether R1Z should be eliminated or just left alone as an additional option.

William Davis explained that one of the reasons that an R1C was considered, was for a 4,000 square foot lot. He stated that during the discussion for this proposal, they decided that 4,000 square foot lots were more appropriate for a PD.

Mark Hermodson stated that his first impression was that he was sympathetic to most of the suggestions. He said that he has always been concerned with the problems of an R1A zone.

KD Benson asked if the maximum lot coverage was based on environmental reasons.

Sallie Fahey stated that it was there for storm drainage, light, air and green space. She said that from a planning perspective, she did not have a problem with increasing lot coverage.

KD Benson asked if the trend was bigger houses with smaller lots and less to mow.

Some one from audience Stated that there are a lot of myths and concerns about density. He said that density was not a bad thing if done right.

Sallie Fahey stated that the trend is toward larger houses on smaller lots.

Mark Hermodson stated that one of the top ten planning principals was to keep development compact and not sprawled.

Brian Keene, 2453 Musket Way, West Lafayette, IN, stated that R1Z was not useable as is. He said that the proposed changes to R1B would accomplish the same density.

Sallie Fahey pointed out that 60' lots on the perimeter are based on the idea that this would be an infill technique and would abut R1B lots. She explained that if R1B were changed then there would be no need to have the perimeter lots in R1C. She said that once there was a decision on how the other zones are adjusted, then it would make sense to look at R1Z.

Brian Keene agreed with that approach. He asked if there were any R1Z subdivisions other than Lexington.

Sallie Fahey stated that Lexington was a PD and there have not been any R1Z subdivisions. She said that the staff would be ready to discuss this further at the next meeting. She asked if there would be anyone willing to plat some examples of these proposals.

KD Benson asked for some examples of lots on curve. She asked why the 10% flexibility was dropped.

Sallie Fahey stated that the staff was more interested in having a realistic minimum than a minimum with a sub-minimum because in many cases the minimum becomes the maximum.

William Davis agreed to plat out some examples.

Sallie Fahey stated that the new Commission members did not have a list of the Ordinance Committee priorities, so she brought extra copies. She offered copies to anyone in the audience as well.

III. SELLING ONE FAMILY VEHICLE PER YEAR

Jay Seeger recapped the purpose of this amendment and the definition of a family vehicle. He pointed out that there previously had not been any limit on how often a person could sell a vehicle on their property. He said that there was a limit of one ton, which brought up the question of selling an RV. He pointed out that a decision needed to be made as to whether to include or exclude RVs. He stated that the intent was to input a footnote defining a family vehicle and allowing the sale of one. He explained that now they were looking at defining what an auto dealer actually is. He said that under State law, anyone who sells more than 3 vehicles must have an automobile dealers license. He stated that if an automobile dealer was properly defined, than that would identify the violators. He said that might be simpler than inputting the footnote. He mentioned that the Ordinance Committee would have to decide on what the concept is and whether an RV would be permitted.

IV. CITIZEN COMMENTS

None

V. ADJOURNMENT

Carl Griffin moved to adjourn the meeting.

Gary Schroeder apologized for being late.

KD Benson stated that she and David Williams would not be at the next Ordinance Committee meeting.

William Davis apologized for not getting the handout to them prior to the meeting.

KD Benson thanked the developers for all the time they have put into this topic and their willingness to work with the staff.

KD Benson adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,



Michelle D'Andrea
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by,



Sallie Dell Fahey
Executive Director